

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-61 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 17-20, 24, 25, 28, 33, 37-39, 43, 44, 47, 51, and 55-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hite et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,774,170 (hereinafter "Hite") in view of Coleman et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,844,620 (hereinafter "Coleman").

Claims 3-5, 8, 11-14, 16, 21-23, 26, 27, 29-32, 34-36, 40-42, 45, 46, 48-50, and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hite in view of Coleman and further in view of Schein et al. U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2003/0005445 (hereinafter "Schein").

II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claims 1, 15-17, 20, 29, 35, 39-48, 53, and 57-61 to more particularly define the claimed invention. No new matter has been added, and the claims are supported by the originally filed application. For example, support for the amended claims can be found in paragraphs 321-340 of applicants' specification.

Reconsideration of this application in light of the amendments and the following remarks is hereby respectfully requested.

III. Independent Claims 1, 39, and 57

The Examiner rejects independent claims 1, 39, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hite in view of Coleman.

Applicants' independent claims 1, 39, and 57, as amended, are directed toward a method, system, and computer readable medium for displaying an advertisement in an electronic program guide (EPG). Television schedule information is stored in a database. Advertisement information is received, and a portion of the received advertisement information is modified at the user equipment to include a first subset of the stored television schedule information to form a modified advertisement. A plurality of television schedule listings comprising a second subset of the stored television schedule information, where the second subset is different from the first subset, is displayed in a schedule guide region of the screen, and the modified advertisement is displayed in a region of the screen outside the schedule guide region. For example, an advertisement modified with television schedule information may be displayed in Ad Window 14 or 16 (FIG. 1) while television schedule listings containing different television schedule information are displayed in Grid Guide 22.

Hite refers to a targeted commercial delivery system that selectively provides electronic advertising messages to different households and display devices. See *Hite, Abstract*. Coleman refers to an interactive program guide interface that allows users to browse through a menu of events while providing continuity of viewing of channel programming. See *Coleman, Abstract*.

The Examiner asserts in the Response to Arguments section of the present Office Action that Hite in combination with Coleman shows a targeted advertisement displayed alongside a portion of an electronic program guide (EPG). *See Office Action, page 2.* The Examiner seems to interpret the combination of the advertisement and part of the EPG to form a modified advertisement. However, the Examiner further asserts that, based on the Examiner's broadest interpretation, the advertisement displayed in the primary display area 200 of Coleman alone can be considered a modified advertisement, even though the EPG displayed alongside the advertisement is in a separate display area 210. *See Office Action, page 2.* While applicants find the Examiner's statements above contradictory, applicants have amended independent claims 1, 39, and 57 to further clarify the claimed invention and to advance prosecution.

More specifically, applicants' amended claims 1, 39, and 57 specify that the received or stored advertisement information is modified to include a first subset of the stored television schedule information, while the concurrently displayed plurality of television schedule listings comprise a second subset of the stored television schedule information. The amended claims further specify that the first and second subsets of television schedule information are different. Since the two subsets of television schedule information contain different information, the television schedule information that is used to modify the advertisement (e.g., the EPG in Coleman) cannot also simultaneously be the same information displayed in the plurality of television schedule listings. In addition,

applicants have amended the independent claims to recite that the modified advertisement is displayed in a region of the screen that is outside the region where the television schedule listings are displayed. The two distinct display regions further clarify that the same television schedule information used to modify the advertisement is not also part of the television schedule listings.

In contrast, the combination of Hite and Coleman only shows one subset of television schedule information (i.e., Coleman's EPG). The combination of Hite and Coleman does not show a modified advertisement in addition to a separate region displaying television schedule listings. Therefore, even if one were to combine Hite with Coleman, the combination would still fail to show or suggest all the features of applicants' amended independent claims 1, 39, and 57.

Accordingly, applicants submit that independent claims 1, 39, and 57 are not rendered obvious in view of Hite and Coleman. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

IV. Independent Claims 20 and 58

The Examiner rejects independent claims 20 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hite in view of Coleman.

Applicants' independent claims 20 and 58, as amended, are directed toward a method and computer readable medium for modifying an advertisement in an EPG. Among other things, independent claims 20 and 58, as amended, recite the steps of

modifying an advertisement with a first subset of television schedule information, and displaying a plurality of television schedule listings comprising a second subset of television schedule information, where the second subset is different from the first subset. Television schedule listings are displayed in a schedule guide region of the screen, and a modified advertisement is displayed in a region of the screen that is outside the schedule guide region.

These features of independent claims 20 and 58 are the same features addressed above in connection with amended independent claims 1, 39, and 57. Therefore, for at least the same reasons described in Section III of this Reply, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 20 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

V. The Dependent Claims

Applicants have demonstrated that amended independent claims 1, 20, 39, 57, and 58 are allowable. Claims 2-19, 21-38, 40-56, and 59-61 each depend from one of claims 1, 20, 39, 57, and 58, and are allowable at least because claims 1, 20, 39, 57, and 58 are allowable.

VI. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, applicants submit that claims 1-61 are allowable over the prior art of record. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt consideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian E. Mack
Registration No. 57,189
Agent for Applicants
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 75563
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8704
(212) 596-9000